

Taiwan. On this day, I strongly believe that Taiwan needs a greater international presence. I support Taiwan's aspirations to be an active member in the international community. It has all the qualifications: a sound political system, a much admired economy, and a genuine desire to maintain peace and stability in East Asia and the world.

With a United Nations membership, Taiwan will become a very useful player, contributing its finances and ideas to combat nuclear proliferation, environmental abuses, human rights violations, and worldwide terrorism. I urge my colleagues to give all their support to Taiwan's bid to become a member of the United Nations and other key international organizations. Taiwan is worthy and a faithful friend of the United States of America.

So, again, I urge all my colleagues to join with me in commending and recognizing Taiwan for their friendship and the strong relationship that exists between our two countries.

POTENTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, on September 11 our Nation was forced to begin to think of the unthinkable. As we watched the World Trade Center collapse and the attack on the Pentagon, our world was changed. It is not a pleasant thing to begin to ponder such consequences and situations, but ponder them I am afraid we must.

Had the fourth airplane succeeded in striking this great building while we were in session or were a terrorist organization to detonate a nuclear weapon during a joint session of the Congress, I am concerned that we could precipitate not only great loss of life but a constitutional crisis.

Under the United States Constitution which we are all sworn to uphold and defend, House Members can only be replaced by direct election. In the event of a national crisis, we would be faced with a situation where our government would lack the counsel and wisdom of this, of this very body until we could be replaced by direct and special elections which could take weeks and possibly even months. Mr. Speaker, this is not a condition we want to exist under.

Though it is difficult to contemplate that scenario, we must contemplate it, which is why I am proposing and will introduce this week an amendment, an amendment to the Constitution which provides for the following scenario: in the event that one quarter or more of the Members of this body should be unable to fulfill their duties due to death or disability or disappearance and presumed death, under that circumstance the Governors of the States from which the Members were absent would be empowered to appoint replacements within 7 days of the loss of the initial Mem-

ber and to serve until such time as a special election within 90 days will provide for replacement under direct election conducted by the States.

It is important that we do this. It is important that we do this so our own citizenry has confidence that even if we were to perish as individuals and even if this building were to be lost, our government and our Constitution would be preserved.

It is important that we do this so our adversaries know that even if they succeed in taking all our lives, the torch of liberty that we hold so dear, the Constitution that we are sworn to defend and uphold will persevere.

This is not a mere thing to contemplate, but I consider it comparable to an unlocked door on the cabinet of the Constitution. We cannot continue to leave that door unlocked. I urge this body, difficult though it may be, complex though it may be, to act with the greatest prudence and expedition in this regard.

Every day that we go without closing this potential gap is a day of vulnerability to our Constitution and to our form of government. I encourage this body to consider my amendment, to join together in reviewing the issues it raises, and to pass as expeditiously as possible some form, be it my amendment or some alternative, that will correct this problem.

Further, I urge this body to address potential ambiguities in the 25th amendment which addresses the line of succession for the line of Presidency and, furthermore, to address questions relating to where the Congress would convene and how it would convene in the events that catastrophic circumstances were to take the lives of our membership.

Finally, I hope State legislatures will contemplate a similar potential scenario within their own structures and implement measures to rapidly replace the governors should that be necessary and to reconstruct their own State legislatures.

I will vigorously pursue this as I think frankly it is one of the single most important things this body can occupy itself with in the coming weeks. I want to thank the Office of the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives who have provided outstanding counsel on this issue, along with representatives from the Congressional Research Service, from the Committee on the Judiciary, and my own staff member, Ryan Hedgepath.

MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all in regards to my colleague before he leaves the House floor, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) I want to

tell the gentleman he is exactly on point.

As the gentleman from Washington knows, we probably came within 30 minutes of a plane hitting this facility or the following day we had an evacuation notice of the Capitol. There is an interesting article that I just read about an hour ago in regards to executive replacement and how every corporation is being derelict in its duty to its shareholders if they do not have some type of transition plan for the chief executive. It talked about how many chief executives died unexpectedly last year and what it did to the corporations, including Atlas Corporation whose president died in a plane crash in the State of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think many of us, including myself, were aware that there was no provision in place in light of a tragedy like this. Now because of this tragedy I think the gentleman has very competently brought up the issue that we better fill in that gap. I hope it never happens, but the fact is it might and we need to have something so that the beat goes on, as our friend, Sonny Bono, used to say. The beat can go on and that is what we need.

I compliment the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) and I look forward to working with him on this.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I am back here again. I know in the news recently the horrible, horrible tragedy that our Nation suffered and there are a couple of things I want to visit about today.

First of all, I just returned from NATO meetings in Ottawa, Canada. I found those meetings very interesting. I want to go into some depth about the NATO meetings, our allies, the commitment from our allies and so on and so forth. I then want to talk about missile defense.

It is time we got serious about missile defense in this country. I want to point out, although it has been buried in the news, about a week ago there was an accidental launch of a missile. It came somewhere from the Ukrainian military. They had no intention of that missile shooting down a passenger airliner and that is exactly what happened. That missile was not intentionally launched. It was launched by accident.

That points out very clearly that if for nothing else, we should have a missile defense system in place in this country in case of an accidental launch of a nuclear weapon or a bio-weapon against this country if it were launched accidentally. We need a defense. So I intend to go into some depth of why missile defense is very applicable under today's times, why it is the responsibilities of us in our leadership roles for future generations as well as the current generations to put missile defense into place for the security of this Nation.

□ 1430

It is absolutely essential.

Let me begin, however, with my remarks on NATO. I had the privilege, I have had the privilege, under the gentleman from Nebraska (Chairman BE-REUTER) of serving on the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. This week we had our meeting in Ottawa, Canada. We were there, in fact, when the United States deployed its response in Afghanistan to the terrible acts of September 11.

I can tell the Members that in the past in these types of meetings, I appreciate our allies, but I am not sure all of them have been soundly behind the United States. Whatever doubts I had were put on the back burner as a result of this meeting. As many Members know, for the first time in 50 years, the first time in the history of NATO, NATO within a few hours activated Article V. Article V simply says that an attack against one NATO country is an attack against all NATO countries.

As soon as NATO was advised of the attack that was occurring, simultaneously to the advisement in the United States of America, they began immediately to activate Article V. They had a completely unanimous approval of activating Article V.

In Canada, it was very interesting, whether it was the Canadians, who have always been good allies to our north, sure, we have some minor scraps here and there, but keep in mind that the Canadian border, and Canada, by the way, is the second largest country in the world, that the Canadian border between Canada and the United States is the longest border in the world across which an unfriendly shot has never been fired. Think about that. We have such great allies in Canada.

Even our non-NATO ally, Mexico, our neighbor to the south, many of the recruiters that I have heard from, some of the recruiters are saying that, especially in the southern part of the States, that they are getting calls from Mexicans. They are getting calls from Mexicans in Mexico who want to enlist in our Armed Forces to fight for the United States of America. Think about that. That is a good neighbor. That is a good ally.

When the going gets tough, that is when we count our friends. At this NATO conference, we could count our friends. Every member of NATO, every member of NATO, excluding none, would have to be counted as friends and allies of the United States of America. Those allies who could not assist us militarily, although all have offered to do that, those who could not assist us militarily are assisting us with intelligence information, are assisting us with disclosures of financial networks, are assisting us with hospital aid. Whatever we want, our allies in NATO have stepped up to the plate. They are willing to do it. They are willing to help the United States.

Whoever envisioned that instead of the United States sending resources to

Europe to assist a NATO country in Europe, that the European countries would be sending resources to the United States, to assist the United States in a time of need?

I want Members to know that we have deployed NATO assets. Today as I speak, today as I speak we have NATO AWACS aircraft flying in U.S. airspace. What are they doing? They are replacing the United States aircraft that have been deployed to the theater of operation. They did not even hesitate for the deployment of military resources to come to that NATO member, the United States of America.

And to our good friends to the north, Canada, let me say a word or two about Canada. Canada has some problems on its border. I think in Canada its immigration laws are not tightly enforced. But lo, the United States criticized Canada, and the United States has serious problems on our border.

Take a look at how many student visas there are in this country, which means we have given the privilege to a non-American citizen from another country, including some countries that we list as terrorist countries, we have given them the privilege to study in the United States, and they have abused the privilege. They have broken the law. They are staying past the time that their student visa has expired. We have tens and tens and tens of thousands of those people in this country, so we certainly have no room to criticize Canada.

But what Canada has done is come together with the United States in a joint effort to tighten our borders. That is exactly what America has to do. That is what every nation in NATO is now looking at doing.

There is no reason whatsoever that when somebody comes across this border, that we do not have a face scan computer or face scan TV that tells us whether or not this person is wanted anywhere in the world. There is no reason at all that we should not search more of these vehicles, that we should not deploy the most technical equipment that we have to determine those people who want to provide ill will to the United States, to those criminals that want to come into the United States.

To those people of cancer, of which I refer to as terrorists, and a terrorist is simply a horrible cancer that has attached itself to our body, there is cancer that wants to come across those borders. Canada has stepped forward with the United States and we are going to tighten these borders.

Do not let people give us this garbage about privacy: "We do not want them to invade our privacy." I can assure the American people that we are not about to violate the Constitution, the constitutional rights of privacy. Those will be protected. But by gosh, if they are going to come in our airports, if they are coming across our border, we will look in their luggage; and that may mean, frankly, to look in your un-

derwear to see if you have a weapon hidden in there. Get used to it.

It is not a violation of privacy, it is an inconvenience. That is what is happening. We are not going against the constitutional rights of privacy. We are not going to touch it. What we are touching is inconvenience. A lot of people do not like to be inconvenienced, but the fact is, our national security comes first. The national security of those allies, including our NATO allies, comes first.

It is about time the United States of America woke up to the fact that not everybody loves us. There are a lot of people that hate us. Newsweek has a full-page cover about why they hate us. Do Members know why, in large regard, they hate us? It is no legitimate reason, in my point of view. Because we have been successful. It is because of the fact that in our society, we think women have equal rights; because in our society we believe, as best we can, that all people are created equal. Is that why they hate us? They hate the whole democratic process.

Does that give legitimacy to their complaints about the United States? I cannot cuss here on the floor, but I can tell the Members very abruptly, of course it gives no legitimacy to that.

But gosh, it was refreshing, it was wonderful to be in Ottawa, Canada, among our NATO allies to hear whether it was the Germans, whether it was Belgians, the French, pat us on the back and say a prayer for us.

We went to the embassy, to our ambassador, who is doing a great job in Canada, the U.S. ambassador. We went to the U.S. embassy. They had displays of the outpouring of support for the United States in our day of tragedy. These are Canadian children, Canadian citizens, Canadian elderly, Canadian corporations, Canadian nonprofits; you name it, the outpouring was unbelievable: little cards that wished us well, from little children that did not understand really what was going on except that the United States had been hurt, and that the United States had been brought to its knees.

But almost all of those letters acknowledged and admired and wanted to help a mighty country, a country that would be able to get back on that horse and ride that horse.

So I will tell the Members, I think all of us, when we see one of our NATO allies, tell them, "Thanks." Because in the time of need, there was no hesitation. There was not one member of NATO, not one member of NATO that hesitated. Every member jumped up. Every member was willing to do whatever was necessary to defeat that cancer that came across our borders, and defeat it we will.

Let me say a special word not only for our Canadians in NATO, but also for the British. Many of the Members, and our constituents are probably aware, but a lot may be confused or may not understand just exactly what the British have done, the United Kingdom. They have stood with us from the

moment it happened as if they had taken down Big Ben in London. I cannot say enough good things about the British and their commitment. Their flyers, their military people, they were there, just like the other NATO members.

But what a privilege to be here and listen to our President, who by the way, has clearly exercised wonderful leadership capabilities; but what a privilege to sit in these chambers and listen to our President deliver a joint address, and see right over here to our left Tony Blair from the United Kingdom in these chambers as well. These are two very powerful leaders in this world, and we recognize our good friends from across the ocean, although it seems like they are just across the street.

Let me say one final word again to Canada. I thank Canada for hosting the NATO meetings that we had up there. Canada is a wonderful country. The first time I heard about it was in Canada, that there was some type of push to make Canada a 51st State. The United States of America has no desire to make Canada the 51st State. The United States of America recognizes Canada as a strong ally, as a strong country; a country of many, many wonderful things.

We want Canada not as a sovereignty of the United States of America, we want Canada as a good neighbor, like a brother, like a sister on our borders.

So that NATO meeting was successful. I want all of my colleagues to know just how important NATO is and how quickly they responded when the call came. When 911 went into NATO headquarters, the garage doors went up and the fire trucks came out. So my thanks to NATO, and I urge all my colleagues to thank them as well.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to talk about the plague or the cancer that we all know about that has hit the United States. Let me tell the Members why I think it is a good analogy to compare this individual and his followers to a cancer.

First of all, cancer does not pick its victims. It does not discriminate with its victims. Cancer can happen to you, it can happen to me. We all know that. I do not know anybody, or at least I have never met anybody, who has had cancer who thought that the cancer was a good neighbor, who thought there was some legitimate reason that that cancer was going to eat their body alive, who thought that they could just pray it off on prayer alone, who thought they could just hope it off on hope alone, or who thought they could just love the cancer off on love alone.

Certainly all three of those factors are critical in a victory against cancer, but the reality of it is, if we want to get rid of cancer, we have to eradicate it. We have to go in and eliminate it.

There is no difference between cancer and what this picture represents. We cannot allow this individual to legitimize his cause. We cannot accept the

rumor or the falsehoods that this individual is trying to put out all over the world that somehow this is a battle against the Muslim population. That is ridiculous. It is not against the Muslims. He killed Muslims, keep that in mind. The bombing of the New York Trade Center had a lot of Muslims in there. It had a lot of people in there of the Islam faith.

Do Members think he is out there for the faith? It is like telling a Catholic, look, go in the Catholic Church and shoot everybody, in the name of being a Catholic. That is exactly what this gentleman, or this horrible cancer, excuse me, that is a misuse of the word, this horrible cancer has done. He did not care whether they were Muslims or people of the Islam religion, he did not care whether they were Irish or black. There were 80 people from 80 separate countries in this world that were in there that are now missing or dead; all presumed dead, of course.

So the fact is, we have to prepare our future for cancers like this. Now is the time. Just like cancer, we figured out that one thing we can do with cancer is preventative medicine: Start watching what we eat, start trying to avoid some things that we can avoid. The fact is, just like cancer, where we take a preventative step against it, that is exactly what this calls for. We have to anticipate that all future generations are going to face this type of cancer. We have to set the policy today that eradication of that cancer is the primary answer.

Let me say, in heavy compliment to the administration, thank goodness we have some hands like Dick Cheney, like Colin Powell, like Condoleezza Rice, like Rumsfeld, like Ashcroft. We have experienced hands down there in the White House administering the emergency response, the war response, of this Nation.

We have a President who has risen to the highest levels of leadership on the moment. When the 911 call went to the White House, this President responded as a President should. He did not go half-cocked. He did not walk out in the corral, pulling his six-shooter, shooting at anything that moved. This President took a deliberate course of response.

I find that one of my colleagues this morning criticized the President, saying that 4 weeks was not enough time for the President to put together any type of response. Give me a break. Here is somebody who has not been involved, one of my colleagues not involved in the planning process. We are not down in the White House. Do not be mistaken. Do not let Congresspeople make us people that we are down in the war room helping the Pentagon and helping the administration plot which terrorist camp to blow up on which day and with what kind of weapons, and what kind of personnel are going to be necessary.

□ 1445

The Congress can criticize the President and in my opinion had no idea of

the planning that went into this. Perhaps it was just the way to take advantage of the time, get a little media or something, my colleague got some media today, but in a time like this, maybe my colleague ought to be a little careful with those kind of responses because the fact is, I think the American people are confident, I am confident and I think the majority of my colleagues are confident that this President is doing what he needs to do, a deliberate, strong, decisive response.

It is happening now even as we speak, and it will be happening a year from now as we speak; and probably it is going to be happening 5 years from now when we speak.

This battle against cancer is going to take some time. We cannot get it all at once, and it is like brain surgery. It is just like taking a brain tumor. The brain cannot be blown out of a head. Well, that cures the cancer all right; but we all know the result of that, and we have to go in with very delicate fine tools and eradicate and eliminate that cancer to the extent that we can do it, and this is exactly what this operation is going to call for.

One of the things I think we have got to look out for in the future clearly is something that we have heard, as cases in Florida have evolved in the last day or so, bioterrorism. Let me tell my colleagues that bioterrorism can be delivered in a missile.

Why do I bring up missiles? Because it is very appropriate for this Nation to deploy, as soon as we possibly can, missile defense.

I say to my colleagues, how many of your constituents out there currently think we have got a defense if somebody fired a missile against this country? Let me explain what we have. We have what is called NORAD. It is located in my good colleague's, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), district down in Colorado Springs. There is a mountain down there that is of granite, and they have taken the inside of that mountain; they have cored it out and they have put what we call NORAD in there. It is our detection system. It has other responsibilities, but detection is its primary tool, primary assignment.

When somebody launches a missile, for example, 2 weeks ago or week and a half ago when the Ukraine launched a missile, unfortunately which hit a passenger airliner, when they launched that missile we were able to detect it. The United States detected that missile on its launch. We can detect any missile launch in the world. We know within seconds if a missile has been launched, and we can tell if a missile is headed to the United States or to Canada; and we can determine what kind of missile it is. We can determine the speed of the missile. We can determine what we think the payload of the missile is going to be.

Guess what? We cannot stop it. Now, how crazy is that? What kind of shortsightedness would let us detect a missile but do nothing to stop the missile?

That missile could contain a nuclear weapon, and most people assume that the missile would contain a nuclear weapon.

What else? It could contain a weapon of bioterrorism. Think of that, a weapon of bioterrorism; and we have no defense against it as we speak today.

We have a President who wants and feels very committed to deploying for this generation and future generations a missile defense system in this country. I have heard some of my colleagues say, oh my gosh, it is going to cost too much. What do they mean cost too much? That cost is minuscule compared to the costs if somebody launches a missile against the United States.

Most of my colleagues here, most of us here, when we talk about missile defense we think about Russia launching a missile against us or China launching a missile against us. Guess what, the horizon has expanded. There are a lot of people, as I will show on a later chart, there are a lot of people who now have the capabilities to launch a missile against the United States. We have a lot of countries who have the capability to generate bioterrorism, and missile delivery is one way of doing it.

Just as important as an intentional launch is an accidental launch. Look what happened last week. The American people need to know that a week ago a missile was launched by mistake, by mistake by the Ukrainian military. They are denying it. First of all, they denied that their military practice was anywhere in the vicinity of that commercial airliner. Then they said, well, maybe they were in the vicinity; but certainly they were not firing or exercising at the time. Then they changed that and admitted, well, maybe they were in the area, and maybe they were exercising at the time; but the missile did not have the capability of hitting that commercial airliner, and I would probably guess or I would guess the next explanation they will have is, yes, they did fire the missile, but what was that airplane doing there in the first place.

The fact is the Ukrainian military 10 days ago, and the American people need to know this, accidentally launched a missile against a commercial airliner and brought the commercial airliner down, killing everybody on board.

My colleagues are going to say, well, missile defense, we are not talking about being able to defend an airliner over the Black Sea. No, but the key and the reason I bring this story up is that it happens. Missiles are launched by accident.

What would happen if somebody like Russia by accident launched a nuclear missile on the United States? If we had the capability to stop that missile, before it hit the United States, we could very easily avoid the next war. Obviously, we would avoid a horrible, horrible disaster in the United States; but

what kind of response would go to Russia if that missile, God forbid, hit New York City or some other city in this country? Would the response be a retaliation of firing a nuclear missile back into Russia?

All of these conflicts are avoided if we are able to shoot that missile down because we have a missile defense system. A missile defense system does not need to be restricted just to America. We can share it with our allies. We can make missiles an ineffective weapon; and it will be a big step towards, in my opinion, the battle of bioterrorism.

Let us look at another couple of charts here. Terrorist attack confirms the growing need for missile defense. Homeland defense is insufficient without missile defense. How do we guarantee the security of this Nation? By the way, we have an inherent obligation, we as Congressmen, and I say that generically, we as Congresspeople have an inherent obligation to the people that we serve, to the Nation that we serve to provide national security for our people. That is our job. That is our obligation. If my colleagues do not want to fulfill that or stand up to the line to do that, get out of this job because out of 435 Congressmen we cannot afford to have one Congressman, we cannot afford to have one Congressman that does not consider their obligation to provide a national security blanket for the United States of America, and a key part of it is missile defense.

Look at this. We have no defense, as I mentioned earlier; and if we thought the September 11 attacks were terrible, wait till a missile hits. We know that it can happen. Terrorist groups, not States, have the means to buy ballistic missiles. One of the things that is interesting is that the Taliban in Afghanistan, they have missiles. Now, fortunately, they are older missiles; but do my colleagues think that if bin Laden or any of his cancerous followers, do they think if any of them possessed a nuclear missile that they would not have used that weapon as their weapon of choice on September 11?

Let me tell my colleagues, if those people get their hands on a missile, those of my colleagues who oppose the proposal and the commitment of this President and most of the Members of this Congress, I believe those who oppose missile defense better be ready to explain to their constituents why, when they had the opportunity, when the technology had become available, they decided that this Nation should not protect itself against people, cancerous people like bin Laden, who decide to lob a missile into this country. The only reason that bin Laden did not use a nuclear missile against the United States of America, the only reason is that he did not have it.

I have got another chart I want to show. This is ballistic missile proliferation. Take a look at it. These are countries that now possess ballistic mis-

siles. Let us talk for a minute about missile defense in the United States and why we have no defense up to this date.

Years ago, in the seventies, the United States and Russia, some of our ivory tower thinkers got together, and I do not understand where they came up with this conclusion but they did, and they said the best way, since there are only really two nations in the world capable of delivering missiles of any kind of destructive capability, and they are the United States and Russia, since there are only two of us, the Soviet Union, let us go ahead and sign a treaty and we will call it the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. In that treaty, they say, we will not attack you; you will not attack us.

My point is that the treaty is obsolete. That treaty is no longer valid, and I want to show my colleagues why. It is valid by its terms, although one of the terms allows us to negate the treaty; and I intend to explain that tomorrow or next week on my further discussion of missile defense, but I want to point out something. Look at what has happened since the seventies. Look at everywhere there is purple, there is missiles; and in all of this purple area, do my colleagues not think there are not people that wish the destruction of the United States, that hate democracy, that hate rights for women, that hate capitalism? Of course it exists. It exists.

I want to point out something further. For example, a good friend of mine, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who is an expert in the military, pointed out to me not long ago, he said, Scott, keep in mind, that countries like Pakistan, which have possession of nuclear weapons, Pakistan, turn on the TV this afternoon and take a look at what is going on in Pakistan. There are some limited riots; but let us, for the sake of an argument, speculate about what happened if those riots became much more vast in their number and what happened if those people who support bin Laden got a hold and overthrew the Pakistani Government.

All of the sudden we would have a bin Laden with nuclear capabilities, nuclear missiles; and guess what, because some of my colleagues might be stubborn about providing the United States with the security blanket of missile defense, we will not have a defense, and let me tell my colleagues, nuclear missiles are only that far away from people like bin Laden.

My point in this speech today is to lay a foundation for my comments next week about the details of the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, about the necessity and frankly the responsibility of my fellow colleagues sitting here on the floor and representatives in the Senate, that obligation to provide the people of this Nation the type of defense apparatus that is necessary to give us the security so that we can live lives without a life of fear.

I also wanted in my comments today, and I want to reiterate it, and that is my appreciation for countries that will assist us in this kind of defense, in putting together a missile defense system. There are countries out there like the United Kingdom and others that will help us with this defensive system; and at some point in time, they will be beneficiaries of it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks by again reiterating my deep appreciation and the deep appreciation of the United States of America to our NATO allies, to all of our allies including Japan, Mexico, any of the allies that are not in NATO; but specifically I want to thank our NATO allies who, as I said earlier, when the 911 call came into their office, the garage doors opened and the fire trucks came out. Every country without exception, every nation in NATO responded immediately by putting up article 5 and by coming forward with the necessary resources or whatever help the United States requested.

I want to remind everybody, today as I speak, flying over U.S. air space are NATO AWACS aircraft. Why? Because we needed the U.S. AWACS aircraft out into the theater of operations so we needed a backfill. NATO put the backfill in that fast. It is good to have friends, but it is even better to have friends when the going gets tough. By gosh, we know the going is tough, and now we can count the friends that really are friends.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRENSHAW). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1752

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 169

Whereas Mike Mansfield, the son of Irish immigrants, was born in 1903 in New York City and raised in Great Falls, Montana;

Whereas Mike Mansfield was the youngest Montanan to serve in World War I, having enlisted in the United States Navy at the age of fourteen;

Whereas Mike Mansfield spent eight years working in the copper mines of Montana;

Whereas Mike Mansfield, at the urging of his wife Maureen, concentrated his efforts on education, obtaining both his high school diploma and B.A. degree in 1933, an M.A. in

1934, and became a professor of history at the University of Montana at Missoula, where he taught until 1952;

Whereas Mike Mansfield was elected to the House of Representatives in 1943 and served the State of Montana with distinction until his election to the United States Senate in 1952;

Whereas Mike Mansfield further served the State of Montana and his country in the Senate from 1952 to 1976, where he held the position of Majority Leader from 1961 to 1976, longer than any Leader before or since;

Whereas Mike Mansfield continued to serve his country under both Democratic and Republican administrations in the post of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan from 1977 to 1989; and

Whereas Mike Mansfield was a man of integrity, decency and honor who was loved and admired by this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Mike Mansfield, formerly a Senator from the State of Montana.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution recognizing the important contributions of the Youth For Life: Remembering Walter Payton initiative and encouraging participation in this nationwide effort to educate young people about organ and tissue donation.

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution honoring the law enforcement officers, firefighters, emergency rescue personnel, and health care professionals who have worked tirelessly to search for and rescue the victims of the horrific attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT ALLOW MILLIONS TO SUFFER NEEDLESSLY IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the international community is not once again going to sit back and allow another giant humanitarian disaster to unfold. U.N. agencies have warned that the humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan is fast approaching historic proportions. The situation in Afghanistan grows worse by the day.

Incredibly, the scale of the Afghanistan humanitarian crisis is now exceeding even the scale of the monumental

refugee disaster which followed the 1994 Rwanda genocide. I cannot believe that just 7 years after Rwanda, we are now preparing to allow millions of innocent men, women, and children to perish in Afghanistan.

The World Food Program now estimates that 6 million Afghan men, women, and children will require food aid inside Afghanistan from October 2001 until the end of March 2002. The U.N. estimates that as a result of the military operations, a further 1.5 million Afghans will flee into Pakistan, Iran, Turkmenistan, and Tajikistan and place the aid agencies in those countries under yet more pressure.

The greatest tragedy is that the children of Afghanistan are being forced to bear the greatest burden of this war. Almost 1.5 million of the at-risk population are children under the age of 5 years; and for them, hunger, illness, and cold conditions can easily lead to death. Even before the September 11 attacks, UNICEF had estimated that one in four children born today in Afghanistan could expect to die before their fifth birthday. Save The Children Fund confirms that the lives of Afghans and especially the hundreds of thousands of Afghan children aged under 5 years are at risk of dying during the coming winter months.

The World Food Program believes that they need to deliver a total of 493,000 metric tons during the next 6 months in order to feed an estimated 6 million people. They have asked for roughly \$250 million. Our Armed Forces have deployed and are using military assets including three aircraft carrier battle groups, including destroyers, escorts, submarines, and other support ships, B-1 and B-2 Stealth bombers, dozens of F-14s, F-15s, F-16s, and F/A 18s, together with helicopters, AWACS, and heavy lift transport, all worth billions of dollars. The World Food Program asked for \$250 million or the cost of 15 cruise missiles. That is the amount that we fired on the first night, or maybe the cost of just two wings of one B-2 Stealth bomber.

The tragedy is that while our military celebrates its precision bombing, millions in Afghanistan suffer.

In Rwanda, up to 1 million people died in the genocide as the U.N. Security Council and member states stood by and cut U.N. troops back from 2,000 to 400. After the worst of the killings were over, international troops were deployed in neighboring Zaire to deliver aid and smile for the cameras. But once the cameras left, hundreds and thousands of Congolese and Rwandan refugees were left helpless. It is now estimated that some 3 million Congolese have died from malnutrition, disease, and other preventable diseases. That amounts to a staggering 7,000 civilian deaths each and every week for the last 3 years, and the number is still counting.

We love our children and we know that the Afghan people love theirs as well. What will they do and all the nations surrounding Afghanistan if the